

represented and suggested that the article would be efficacious as a hog regulator; that it would improve the thrift and regulate the bowels of hogs and assist in keeping them free from worms; that it would aid in preventing disease in hogs; that it would be efficacious to build the frame of pigs and to fatten pigs; that it would absorb fermentative gases; that it would act as an alterative; that it would exert a toxic action on intestinal parasites; that it would sweeten the stomach, prevent fermentation, and reduce toxicity of some poisonous compounds; that it would act as a bowel regulator; that it was a nerve food and tonic which was especially good for sows down in the back; that it would build blood corpuscles and make the system vigorous; that it was of value in the treatment of seatworms (pinworms); that it would deaden intestinal worms so that they could be passed out; and that it contained not more than 10 percent of sodium chloride (salt). The article contained not less than 32.05 percent of sodium chloride, and it would not be efficacious for the purposes represented.

Standard Stock Tonic. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in the circulars entitled "Standard Stock Tonic, Directions For Use," which accompanied the article, were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article would make the feed more palatable to horses, improve the digestion, and give more vigor, better spirits, greater endurance, and a smooth, glossy coat to horses; that it would build up the milk yield in cows and would be especially valuable for breeding troubles in dairy cows; that it would expel worms of hogs, keep hogs in splendid condition, put hogs in fine finish, and keep them on a heavy feed in condition; that it would be especially valuable for stomach worms of sheep; that it would sustain and strengthen the sheep at lambing time; that it would be efficacious to keep young stock thrifty and promote growth; that it would be efficacious as a worm expeller and stomach tonic; that it would be valuable as a strength builder; that it would purify the blood, remove and prevent skin eruptions caused by impure blood, prevent hyperacidity, and sweeten the stomach; that it would act as a nerve tonic and invigorate the functioning of every bodily organ; that use of the article was necessary to prevent breeding troubles; that the article would build up milk production, prevent weak calves, colts, and pigs, overcome breeding troubles, and build bone; that the article would overcome and prevent constipation; that it would act as a diuretic on kidney, liver, and bowels; that the article would be effective as an adjunct to worm expellers; that it would aid digestion and help formation of red corpuscles; that it would absorb gases in the stomach and intestines; that it was a tonic and conditioner; and that it would furnish in the right balance the supplements required by cattle and horses for worm expellers, tonics, conditioners, bowel regulators, and appetizers. The use of the article was not necessary to prevent breeding troubles; it was not a tonic and conditioner; and it would not be efficacious for the purposes represented.

Standard Egg-O-Day. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain label statements were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article would be efficacious to cause hens to lay one egg a day; and that the article contained not more than 10 percent of sodium chloride (salt). The article contained not less than 18.69 percent of sodium chloride, and it would not be efficacious to cause hens to lay one egg a day.

DISPOSITION: March 1, 1946. Pleas of nolo contendere having been entered, the corporate defendant was fined \$10 on each of the 6 counts of the information, and each of the individual defendants was fined \$5 on each of the 6 counts.

1868. Adulteration and misbranding of soap. U. S. v. 557 Dozen Cakes of Soap.
Consent decree of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond.
(F. D. C. No. 17619. Sample No. 3131-H.)

LIBEL FILED: September 28, 1945, District of Columbia.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about August 24, 1945, from New York, N. Y., by the New Brunswick Laboratories.

PRODUCT: 557 dozen cakes of soap at Washington, D. C.

LABEL, IN PART: "Castile Soap U. S. P."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Adulteration, Section 501 (b), the article purported to be hard soap, a drug the name of which is recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia, an official compendium, but its quality and purity fell below the official standard since it contained more alkali hydroxides and alkali carbonates than the limits specified for hard soap by the Pharmacopoeia.

Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the statements in the labeling of the article, "Soap U. S. P." and "Made from pure olive oil * * * The U. S. P.—100% pure olive oil soap," were false and misleading as applied to the article, which was not made from olive oil and which did not comply with the requirements of the Pharmacopoeia for alkali hydroxides, alkali carbonates, iodine value and solidifying point of the combined fatty acids, and the limit of saturated acids.

DISPOSITION: December 3, 1945. The New Brunswick Laboratories, claimant, having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond for repackaging and relabeling under the supervision of the Federal Security Agency.

1869. Adulteration and misbranding of gauze pads. U. S. v. 46 Boxes of Gauze Pads. Consent decree of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond. (F. D. C. No. 17314. Sample No. 3645-H.)

LIBEL FILED: August 24, 1945, District of Maryland.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about June 15, 1945, by the Handy Pad Supply Co., from Worcester, Mass.

PRODUCT: 46 boxes of gauze pads at Baltimore, Md. Examination showed that the product was not sterile but was contaminated with living micro-organisms.

LABEL, IN PART: (Boxes) "100 M-B Gauze Pads Absorbent Size 12"x18" Gauze Folded 3"x3" * * * Sterilized After Packaging."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Adulteration, Section 501 (b), the article purported to be "Sterile Absorbent Gauze [Sterile Gauze]," a drug the name of which is recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia, an official compendium, but its quality and purity fell below the official standard since it was not sterile.

Misbranding, Section 502 (g), the article was not labeled as is prescribed in the Pharmacopoeia, since the type of gauze was not stated on the label.

DISPOSITION: November 16, 1945. The Handy Pad Supply Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond, conditioned that it be resterilized and relabeled under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

1870. Adulteration and misbranding of gauze. U. S. v. 150 Boxes and 400 Boxes of Gauze. Consent decrees of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond. (F. D. C. Nos. 17032, 17163. Sample Nos. 7217-H, 29086-H.)

LIBEL FILED: August 9 and 23, 1945, Northern District of New York and Northern District of California.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about May 4 and 11, 1945, by Allen Laboratories, Inc., from Palmer, Mass.

PRODUCT: 150 boxes and 400 boxes, each containing 500 units, of gauze at Binghamton, N. Y., and San Francisco, Calif., respectively.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Adulteration, Section 501 (b), the article purported to be "Sterile Absorbent Gauze [Sterile Gauze]," a drug the name of which is recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia, an official compendium, but its quality and purity fell below the official standard since it was not sterile but was contaminated with living micro-organisms.

Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statement "Sterilized" was false and misleading.

DISPOSITION: April 23 and May 17, 1946. Allen Laboratories, Inc., claimant, having consented to the entry of decrees, judgments of condemnation were entered and the product was ordered released under bond, conditioned that the unfit portion be segregated and resterilized under the supervision of the Federal Security Agency.

1871. Adulteration and misbranding of prophylactics. U. S. v. 22 Gross and 47 Gross of Prophylactics. Default decrees of destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 17551, 18052. Sample Nos. 18417-H, 47470-H.)

LIBELS FILED: October 27, 1945, and February 28, 1946, District of Minnesota and District of Utah.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about October 8, 1945, and January 7, 1946, by the Akron Drug and Sundries Co., from Akron, Ohio.

PRODUCT: 22 gross of prophylactics at Salt Lake City, Utah, and 47 gross of Prophylactics at Minneapolis, Minn. Examination of samples disclosed that 3.7 percent of those from the Minnesota lot and 7.9 percent of those from the Utah lot were defective in that they contained holes.